

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. The amendments to independent claims 18, 27, and 37 are supported by paragraph [0064] of the published application.

Claims 1 - 3, 5 - 10, 12 - 14, and 16 - 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lester (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0140958) in view of Hohensee (U.S. Patent No. 6,407,821).

Independent Claims 1, 8 and 16 pertain to an image forming device, an image forming program, and an image forming method, respectively. The image forming device includes a receiving unit for successively receiving constituent data of a document file and a storing unit for successively storing objects contained in the constituent data. The image forming device further includes a judging unit that judges whether all of the necessary objects out of a plurality of objects contained in the document file are stored in the storing unit and an image forming unit that forms images of a specific page when it is judged by the judging unit that all objects necessary for displaying the specific page are stored in the storing unit regardless of whether the plurality of objects included in the document file have been stored in the storing unit or not.

Additionally, independent Claims 18, 27 and 37 provide for an image forming device, program, and method, including a receiving unit for successively receiving constituent data of said document file and a storing unit, as described above, and further including a judging unit for judging whether the amount of usage of the storing unit has exceeded a prescribed limit of usage. The image forming device, program, and method also include an image forming unit for forming images of objects stored

in the storing unit either singly or in combination of two or more regardless of the order displayed in the document when it is judged by the judging unit that the amount of usage of the storing unit has exceeded the prescribed limit of usage. Further, a deleting unit deletes the object whose image has been formed by the image forming unit from the storing unit.

In rejecting independent Claims 1, 8 and 16, the Official Action relies on the disclosure of Lester at paragraphs [0041]-[0044]. This passage describes the receipt of a PDF file at a printer. Commands of the PDF file are parsed in a sequential manner by an interpreter. The commands accumulate on a data structure. The interpreter determines if the end of the file is encountered. If the end is not encountered, then the interpreter continues to parse the commands of the PDF file. If the end of the file is encountered, device ready bits are produced and the document is printed.

With regard to the claimed judging unit, the Official Action refers to Figure 5 and paragraph [0044] of Lester. However, Lester does not teach or suggest a judging unit for judging whether all objects necessary for displaying a specific page out of the plurality of objects included in the document file are stored in said storing unit. In contrast to the judging unit of claim 1, Lester looks for the end of the file. Looking for an end of file indication is completely different than looking to see if what is stored in a storing unit is sufficient to display a specific page. A primary difference is that it may be sufficient to display a specific page before the end of the file has been received. Accordingly, Lester does not teach or suggest the judging unit.

The Official Action also refers to Hohensee as allegedly teaching a judging unit for judging whether all objects necessary for displaying a specific page out of the

plurality of objects included in the document file are stored in said storing unit.

However, Hohensee also operates in a different manner. As with Lester, Hohensee also looks for an end of file marker. See column 2, lines 28 - 31 ("Since the file trailer is at the end of the file, the entire file must be loaded before printing can start.") Although Hohensee does not download duplicate objects, there is no teaching or suggestion in Hohensee of judging whether all objects necessary for displaying a specific page included in the document file are stored in a storing unit.

Accordingly, since neither Lester, nor Hohensee teaches or suggests a judging unit for judging whether all objects necessary for displaying a specific page out of the plurality of objects included in the document file are stored in said storing unit, the combination of claim 1 is not taught or suggested by the applied prior art.

Claims 2 - 3, 5 - 10, 12 - 14, and 16 - 17 are patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 4 and 11 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lester and Hohensee, and further in view of JP 09-174955, hereinafter Abe. However, Abe does not overcome the deficiency of Lester and Hohensee, discussed above. Accordingly, claims 4 and 11 are also patentable.

Claims 18, 27, and 37 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lester and in view of Abe.

Claim 18 relates to an image forming device for receiving a document file and forming images of said document file, wherein said document file contains objects for displaying a part or all of the contents of each page of the document and being capable of lining up in the file regardless of the order of said contents displayed in said document. The device includes, among other elements, a receiving unit for successively receiving constituent data of said document file before the constituent

data is converted into print data; and a storing unit for successively storing said objects contained in said constituent data before the constituent data is converted into print data.

The Examiner acknowledges that Lester does not teach or suggest the claimed judging unit, and relies upon Abe for an alleged teaching of judging whether an amount of usage of the storing unit has exceeded a prescribed limit of usage. However, the Examiner must consider the references as a whole. Abe functions quite differently than the device of claim 18. Specifically, in the Abe device, the data in Abe is converted into print data by the PC or external device 20. It is not converted by the image forming device. Accordingly, the data stored in the Abe storage device is different than the data stored in the storing unit of claim 18, which has not yet been converted to print data. Since this will affect the size of the data, the two units are quite different from each other.


Accordingly, one skilled in the art solving the problems to which the present invention is addressed would not be motivated to look to the teachings of Abe. Claims 27 and 37 are patentable over the applied prior art for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 18. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 18, 27, and 37 should be withdrawn.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: 12-9-2008

By:   
William C. Rowland  
Registration No. 30888

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620